

Remarks

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-27 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to include text from claim 12 and more closely follow the description found in the specification in paragraphs [0027], [0028], and [0036] through [0044]. Similar amendments to dependent claims 2-4, 6, 13-16, 26, and 27 have been made to more closely follow the description found in the specification. Claims 5, 12, and 28 have been canceled. New claims 29-33 have been added that are directed to a method for receiving a compressed template and delta information that define a web page. New claims 34 and 35 have been added to include steps similar to amended claims 13 and 14, but now dependent on claim 7. Support for these new claims can be found in paragraphs [0032] through [0044]. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-27, and 29-35 remain pending in this application.

Examiner Interview Summary

The Applicant thanks Examiner Bataille for the telephone interview today with the undersigned where the language of claim 1 and the Applicant's remarks previously presented regarding the present invention compression of the static information of a web page and storage of that compressed static information in a cache were discussed. Based on this interview, the Applicant has revised the claims to more precisely claim working with particular compressed information in a cache.

In addition, by way of a separate submission today, the undersigned requests an Examiner interview to discuss any further clarifications on the teachings of the cited references and how the language of the present claims overcome the objections raised by the Examiner. Applicant requests that such interview be scheduled once this response has been received by the Examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

A supplemental information disclosure statement is being filed along with this response that cite references that were recently cited in some of the related patent applications.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 24, and 26 - 28 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. 6,405,252 (Gupta '252) in view of Raz et al. US2001/0037400 (Raz '400). These claims have been rewritten into amended claims 1-3, 6-11, 13-24, and 26-27 as well as new claims 29-35. As such the following remarks from the Applicant refer to this new set of claims. The Examiner stated that "Gupta fails to specifically teach compressed version of static information related to the web page." The Applicant agrees with this assessment of Gupta et al. '252.

As in several previous office actions, the Examiner repeats the argument on page 5 that:

it is known that wireless communication devices and Web or proxy servers use compressed web pages wherein, in response to a request for a Web page, a first portion of the requested Web content is static so as to be independent of the response received from network sites a second portion of the content is dynamic so as to be determined by the response from the network site.

The Applicant respectfully continues to object to the characterization of what is known and unknown in the art without providing foundation for such a statement based on evidence. As previously stated by the Applicant, the Applicant respectfully requests that such evidence be provided or this unsubstantiated objection about compression be withdrawn.

In an alternative argument, the Examiner cited Raz '400 with particular reference to paragraphs [0035], [0042], [0052], and [0071]-[0075]. The Examiner stated that Raz '400 teaches a method for streaming static web pages to the client where the pages transmitted are compressed for transmission and subsequently cached in local memory. The Applicant agrees with this characterization as far as it goes. However, the Applicant respectfully points out that Raz '400 is describing the manipulation of entire/complete static web pages in its streaming manager. The present invention, as claimed, is manipulating discrete elements of, rather than, entire or complete web pages that are either static or dynamic in nature. As described in the presently pending claims, elements of a web page are divided into a template (having static, relatively unchanging elements) and delta information (having dynamic, highly variable elements).

Further, Raz '400 does not teach storing compressed pages in a cache, but rather only receives compressed pages. Furthermore, Raz '400 actually teaches away from the present invention by teaching that the streaming manager decompresses the web pages rather than serve compressed web pages (see for example paragraph [0042]).

Thus, Raz '400 fails to teach splitting individual web pages into a template and delta information as presently claimed. In addition, Raz '400 fails to teach, as claimed in present claim 1, 7, 17, and 29, compressing the template, storing the compressed template in a cache and serving that compressed template from the cache to a user in response to a request for a web page.

In view of the foregoing, Raz '400 alone, or in combination with Gupta et al. '252, fails to teach the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 7, 17, and 29.

Claims 2-4, 6, 13-16, 26, and 27 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 8-11 and 34-35 depend from claim 7 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 for the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable. Claims 30-33 depend from claim 29 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 for the same reasons that claim 29 is allowable. Claims 18-25 depend from claim 17 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 for the same reasons that claim 17 is allowable.

The Examiner references Hawkins with respect to claims 22-24, but fails to identify if this is the same reference from the prior office action. Nonetheless, claims 22-24 depend from claim 17 and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252 and Hawkins for the same reasons that claim 17 is allowable.

Therefore, the rejection of claims amended 1-3, 6-11, 13-24, and 26-27 as well as new claims 29-35 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. '252 in view of Raz '400 should be withdrawn, because Gupta et al. '252 and Raz '400 fail to teach all elements of the present invention as claimed.

Claims 4 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta ' 252 in view of Raz '400, and further in view of Jungck 6,728,785 (Jungck '785).

Jungck '785, like Gupta et al. '252 and Hawkins et al. '318 fails to teach all elements of the present invention as claimed. In particular, Jungck '785 does not teach, as presently claimed in independent claims 1 and 17, the storage of a compressed version of a template having static, relatively unchanging elements of a web page in a cache of a web server and subsequently serving the compressed template from the cache in response to a request for the web page. Claims 4 and 25 depend from independent claims 1 and 17, respectively, and therefore are allowable over Gupta et al. '252, Raz '400, and Jungck '785 for the same reasons that claims 1 and 17 are allowable. Thus, the rejection of claims 4 and 25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. '252 in view of Raz '400 and further in view of Jungck '785, should be withdrawn.

The Applicant has reviewed the other references cited by the Examiner and determined that they do not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed.

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-27, and 29-35 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DIGITAL RIVER, INC.

By its agent:

NORTH OAKS PATENT AGENCY
45 Island Road
North Oaks, Minnesota 55127
(612) 850-1688

Date: 28 August 2006

By: /Shawn B Dempster/
Shawn B. Dempster, Registration No. 34,321

C:\NOPA\CLIENTS\DIGITAL RIVER D33\019-01-US - EFFICIENT COMPRESSION USING DIFFERENTIAL CACHING\060828 RESPONSE TO FINAL OA.DOC